

CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, OLSTEIN, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.
COUNSELLORS AT LAW

CHARLES C. CARELLA
BRENDAN T. BYRNE
PETER G. STEWART
ELLIOT M. OLSTEIN
ARTHUR T. VANDERBILT, II
JAN ALAN BRODY
JOHN M. AGNELLO
CHARLES M. CARELLA
JAMES E. CECCHI

JAMES D. CECCHI (1933-1995)
JOHN G. GILFILLAN III (1936-2008)

JAMES T. BYERS
DONALD F. MICELI
A. RICHARD ROSS
KENNETH L. WINTERS
JEFFREY A. COOPER
CARL R. WOODWARD, III
MELISSA E. FLAX
DENNIS F. GLEASON
DAVID G. GILFILLAN
G. GLENNON TROUBLEFIELD
BRIAN H. FENLON
LINDSEY H. TAYLOR
CAROLINE F. BARTLETT

**5 BECKER FARM ROAD
ROSELAND, N.J. 07068-1739
PHONE (973) 994-1700
FAX (973) 994-1744
www.carellabyrne.com**

RICHARD K. MATANLE, II
FRANCIS C. HAND
AVRAM S. EULE
RAYMOND W. FISHER
OF COUNSEL

RAYMOND J. LILLIE
WILLIAM SQUIRE
ALAN J. GRANT^o
STEPHEN R. DANEK
ERIC MAGNELLI
DONALD A. ECKLUND
AUDRA E. PETROLLE
MEGAN A. NATALE
AMANDA J. BARISICH
ZACHARY S. BOWER+
MICHAEL CROSS

^oMEMBER NY BAR ONLY
+MEMBER FL BAR ONLY

July 24, 2012

VIA ECF

Honorable Jose L. Linares, U.S.D.J.
United States District Court
M.L. King, Jr. Federal Building & Courthouse
50 Walnut Street
Newark, New Jersey 07101

**Re: *Larson, et al. v. Sprint, et al.*
Civil Action No. 07-5325 (JLL)**

Dear Judge Linares:

We are co-counsel for the Class in the above matter. Please accept this letter as Plaintiffs' response to Sprint's order to show cause to enjoin the California plaintiffs in the *Robertson* Nextel litigation and the *Zill* appeal.

We support Sprint's application. While the Third Circuit vacated final approval of the Settlement, it remains subject to preliminary approval. As a result, the Court may properly enjoin under the All Writs Act further prosecution of claims which are the subject of the Settlement, just as it previously did with respect to the California Subscriber Class claims (Docket Entry 139), and refused to lift the injunction against further prosecution of those claims after the Court first denied final approval of the Settlement. (Docket Entry 335). California counsel's attempts to revive the California litigation is "obstructing this Court's path to judgment", and, thus, should be enjoined.

Thank you for your continued attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI,
OLSTEIN, BRODY & AGNELLO

/s/ James E. Cecchi

JAMES E. CECCHI

cc: All Counsel (via ECF)